

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

**DEBRA A. MOORE**

**PLAINTIFF**

**VS.**

**NO. 4:14CV162-DMB-JMV**

**HARTFORD CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY**

**DEFENDANTS**

**ORDER STAYING CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS**

This case comes before the court pursuant to Plaintiff's Motion to Stay Remand Proceedings and for Authority to Conduct Remand Related Discovery [9]. The court has considered the motion, Defendant's response [14], the applicable law and the record and rules as follows:

Pursuant to L. U. Civ. R. 16(b)(1)(B),

[a] motion to remand . . . will stay the attorney conference and disclosure requirements and all discovery not relevant to the remand . . . issue and will stay the parties' obligation to make disclosures pending the court's ruling on the motion[.]. . . .

Based on this authority, the case will be stayed with respect to the case management conference and the proceedings listed in the rule. Additionally, only discovery *not relevant to the remand issue* is stayed, i.e., plaintiff may conduct any discovery that *is* relevant to the remand issue. However, because defendant contends the discovery sought by plaintiff here is *not* relevant to the remand issue, plaintiff shall file a reply brief—within 7 days of this date—substantiating the need for discovery that *is* relevant.

**THEREFORE IT IS ORDERED:**

1. That the above noted proceedings and the case management conference are hereby **STAYED** pending a decision on the motion to remand.
2. That plaintiff shall file a reply brief in response to defendant's contention that the

discovery plaintiff seeks is not relevant to the remand issue within 7 days of this date.

3. That the deadline for plaintiff's reply to defendant's response to the motion to remand is stayed until further order of the court.

**THIS**, the 12th day of January, 2015.

/s/ Jane M. Virden  
**U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE**